

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 6, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 2 and 11 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, or added; as a result, claims 1-12 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 2, line 7, "by neighboring sensors" should be – by said neighboring sensors -- ; and Claim 11, line 9, "a neighboring sensor" should be – said neighboring sensor. Appropriate correction was required.

Applicant has amended claims 2 and 11 as suggested by the Examiner.

§ 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Spivey et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,886,353). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 9, the Examiner cites the Spivey reference as describing, "wherein for the at least one of said pixels (defective pixels) an associated offset value equals an associated gain value during the imaging operation". (Sections 4 and 10 of the April 6, 2006, Office Action). The reference states, "The multiplexed analog signals are modified using software programmable voltage gain and offset amplifiers in order to optimize the input of the analog-to-digital converters." (Col. 13, lines 59-61). As such, Spivey appears to describe utilizing programmable voltage gain and offset amplifiers to optimize the input of the analog-to-digital converters. The reference does not show that for at least one of the pixels an associated offset value equals an associated gain value during an imaging operation.

In contrast, independent claim 1 recites, "wherein for the at least one of said pixels an associated offset value equals an associated gain value during the imaging

operation". The cited section is the only instance in the specification and claims of the Spivey reference that correlates voltage gain and offset amplifiers. There are no occurrences in the Spivey reference whereby an offset value and a gain value are correlated.

In addition, independent claim 5 recites, "for which an associated offset value equals an associated gain value during the imaging operation".

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element and limitation of independent claims 1, 5, and 9 is not present in the Spivey reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102 rejection of independent claims 1, 5, and 9, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 8, and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Examiner indicated claims 4, 8, and 12 contain allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: **MS AMENDMENT** Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 8th day of June, 2006.

Sarah L. Reinhard
Name

[Signature]
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Gerald J. Reeves, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:

[Signature]
Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date:

6/8/2006